

The Brethren Evangelist,

ASHLAND, OHIO.

A. D. GNAGEY, : : Editor.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 31, 1895.

A NOBLE MAN HAS FALLEN.

It is with a sad heart that we chronicle the death of our dear Brother Herrington. In his death the church has lost one of its grandest men and most enthusiastic workers. Beginning with the family, the loss will be most deeply felt in that Christian home where he was the kind husband and affectionate father. Sister Herrington and family have the sympathy of the brotherhood in their irreparable loss and consequent sore bereavement. We commend them to him who has promised to be the counsellor of the widow and the father of the fatherless. The local church at Lanark, Ill., where Brother Herrington held his membership, sustains a great loss in his removal by death. He was earnest, zealous, in every good work, a natural leader of men. The song service in that church, led by him, was a great help to Brother Livengood in his public ministry, and we feel safe in saying, the means of bringing more than one soul to Jesus. His voice there will be heard no more, but tuned to sweeter strains, it joins the inhabitants of the spirit land, in singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. His lips though silent yet speak, and his exemplary life, will continue to preach that Gospel of whose power and grace, he will forever remain a living witness. The community in which he lived has lost a good citizen and useful man. The church at large feels the loss it has sustained in parting with Brother Herrington. At our last National Conference, he endeared himself to all who formed his acquaintance. When there was danger of discussions and debates becoming too spirited, his loving voice was heard to say, "Let us sing," and the sweet strains of music, made us feel that we are one in Christ Jesus.

We had hoped that our brother would be restored to health and that his presence would again gladden the coming conference, but our hopes have met with sudden disappointment, and now we bow to the will of him who doeth all things well. He has gone to his eternal home,

where he shall rest from his labors, but his works follow him.

It was through the earnest, unselfish appeal of Brother Herrington, that we were made willing to abide by the verdict of last conference, and come to Ashland to assume the responsible duties of the editorial work of the EVANGELIST. With him, self seems to have been no consideration. He lived largely for others; in his larger life and soul, self was lost. He suffered long, but endured his suffering with christian patience, as becomes a true child of God. There were long months of struggle, and finally he yielded to the call of death. "How mysterious are the ways of God, past finding out." May the God of compassion comfort the bereaved; and may his example be an inspiration to others to strive more earnestly to attain to that christian manhood and womanhood made possible through Christ Jesus our Lord and Master.

FALSE LIBERALISM.

It is not for the sake of controversy, that we attempt a review and criticism of the article by Brother Cassel on "Open vs. Close Communion." To us the sentiment expressed and the thoughts advanced, are dangerous in their tendencies, and duty requires that we stand for the defense of the Gospel. It is comfortable to be liberal in one's views. Narrow mindedness and bigotry are not the spirit of the Master, nor of the blessed Gospel we preach. Such a spirit does not make for peace, but rather genders strife. To be comfortable and happy, one needs to take a broad and liberal view of the Gospel and the life it promises. But there is such a thing as being liberal to a fault; there is that which in these days of skepticism, is properly designated as "false liberalism." That which comes to us with a plea for broader views and more liberal interpretation of God's word, proves too often but another form of infidelity in disguise. We believe in the most liberal interpretation of the word that can be put upon it, consistent with the great and fundamental principles of our holy religion. But when Gospel principles are to be sacrificed for the sake of liberalism, we shall sacrifice liberalism and hold on to the principles of the blessed Gospel of the Son of God. A careful analysis of the article in question, will bring out the illogical statements, the weakness of the reasoning process and the fallacy of the arguments employed.

Brother Cassel says, "I have yet to learn that salvation depends upon an outward rite, whatever be its form or mode; the Saviour has left upon record an outward rite to express an inward fact, if the inward fact does not exist the outward rite is a mere dead letter." One word would have put this sentence beyond controversy, that word, *alone* after the first rite. As it stands it is misleading, making the outward rite of no consequence at all. If the Saviour has left on record the outward rite, why ignore that rite, and represent it as of no consequence in the plan of salvation? The question to be considered is this, Can the inward fact exist without the outward rite? If so, then the latter may be entirely ignored and what the Saviour has left on record is already a "dead letter." Over against the brother's statement let us put this: If the outward rite does not exist, then the inward fact *cannot* exist, and we have as much scripture for one as for the other. The reasoning employed here by our brother is weak, and will not hold anywhere else, neither will it in religion. How can there be an inside without an outside? Has the brother ever seen anything that had but *one* side? Now while the outward rite may exist without the inward fact, we deny that the inward fact may exist without the outward rite.

The next statement is still wider of the mark.—"Baptism is no where (except in the creeds of men) made a condition of salvation, if it were, salvation would be a sure result of baptism." We are not a little surprised at these two statements. The first, we claim is incorrect, and if it were, the second would not necessarily follow. Now is it really true that if baptism were a condition of salvation, that therefore salvation would be a sure result of baptism? It is not difficult to see the fallacy of this statement or this process of reasoning. Is not a shell necessary to a kernel? No kernel has ever developed without the shell. The shell is absolutely necessary to the development of the kernel. This being so, according to the above reasoning, the shell would be unmistakable evidence of the life germ or kernel within. But we know it is not. This is a rude illustration, but an exact parallel case. The shell may exist without the kernel, but the kernel, never without the shell. Apply this to baptism.

But how about this statement,—"Baptism is no where (except in the creeds of men) made a condition of salvation. It